<div align="center">

REMARKS

</div>

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-13, 15-21, 25-28, 30, 32 and 35 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-13, 15-21, 25-28, 32 and 35 have been amended herein to correct minor informalities. A listing of the claims can be found at pp. 2-7 above.

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Gelagay for the courtesies extended during the interview conducted on February 13, 2009. During the interview, applicants' representative discussed the distinctions between the subject claims over the cited art. Such distinctions are presented in full detail below.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   Rejection of Claims 1-4, 8, 10, 12, 14, 20, 25-26, 32 and 35 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4, 8, 10, 12, 14, 20, 25-26, 32, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Phillips, *et al.* (U.S. 6,721,555) in view of Hocker, *et al.* (U.S. 5,923,757) and in view of Bartek, *et al.* (U.S. 2004/0122649). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.* and Bartek, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

The claimed subject matter relates installation or authentication of remote or wireless devices through a common physical interface. Conventional host computer device installation and authentication schemes are highly deficient as applied to wireless or remote devices. For example, with the increasing number of wireless networks, it is difficult to install a wireless device with a particular network entity because the network entity does not know when to install the wireless device or even which wireless device to install. Physical coupling, on the other hand, indicates a manifest intent that a particular device be installed at a specific time. Moreover, although wireless networks and devices provide a vast number of benefits, a hard-wired network or device is typically more secure because wireless connections are prone to "sniffing" and other hacking techniques. On the other hand, by physically connecting devices to the network entity via an electrical interface, a user indicates to the network entity a desire to install the device and the device and network entity can exchange information securely without the risk of others "sniffing" the data exchange. By utilizing the advantages of a physical

connection to establish a non-physical connection, the complications of conventional installation or authentication techniques or systems for wireless devices between network entities can be mitigated.

To this end, independent claim 1 recites in part, "*a physical interface component that physically couples at least two devices to establish a non-physical connection between the at least two devices*, wherein the physical interface component comprises *a token key that physically connects the at least two devices simultaneously, stores at least one of an installation protocol or an authentication protocol for later use and establishes the non-physical connection*." Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.*, and Bartek, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element as recited in independent claim 1. In fact, Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.* and Bartek, *et al.* each describe conventional installation or authentication techniques or systems that suffer from the previously described complications with regard to confusion regarding which device to install and when to install the device, as well as authentication and security.

Phillips, *et al.* relates to a system and method for handling and supporting authentication protocols in a wireless communications network. *See* col. 1, lines 12-15. However, such authentication protocols are related *via* a wireless system in which packets are relayed via a series of reverse links. *See, e.g.,* Fig. 3. This conventional installation system and method suffer from the aforementioned deficiencies that the claimed subject matter mitigates. Additionally, the Examiner admits that Phillips, *et al.* is silent with regard to *a physical interface component that physically couples at least two devices to establish a non-physical connection between the at least two devices* and *a token key that physically connects the at least two devices simultaneously, stores at least one of an installation protocol or an authentication protocol for later use and establishes the non-physical connection. See* O.A. p. 3, para. 1-2. Accordingly, Phillips, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest each and every element as recited in independent claim 1.

Hocker, *et al.*, which relates to establishing a secure wireless connection between a computer system and a mouse, fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Phillips, *et al.* Like Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.* describes a wireless system with no physical connection. Hocker, *et al.* establishes a secure wireless connection between a portable device and a selected intelligent device, in the presence of a plurality of intelligent devices, *via*

wirelessly exchanging an address identifier and an encryption key. *See* col. 3, lines 16-27. Through the use of limited range wireless communications, this information can be exchanged without also revealing the information to other intelligent devices not in sufficiently close proximity. *See* col. 3, lines 27-31. However, this limited range wireless communication is not a physical connection, so it still suffers from the aforementioned deficiencies of traditional installation or authentication systems. Accordingly, Hocker, *et al*. does not teach or suggest *a physical interface component that physically couples at least two devices to establish a non-physical connection between the at least two devices*. Moreover, the Examiner admits that Hocker, *et al*. is silent with regard to *a token key that physically connects the at least two devices simultaneously, stores at least one of an installation protocol or an authentication protocol for later use and establishes the non-physical connection*. *See* O.A. p. 3, para. 1-2. Therefore, Hocker, *et al*. fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Phillips, *et al*.

Bartek, *et al*., which relates to a system and method for emulating a physical connection using a wireless connection, fails to remedy the aforementioned deficiencies of Phillips, *et al*. and Hocker, *et al*. Bartek, *et al*. provides for "a system that wireless couples a computer to a peripherals (sic)." *See* [0002]. This system is a "wireless cable replacement." *See, e.g.*, Title. Like Phillips, *et al*. and Hocker, *et al*., Bartek, *et al*. suffers from the previously described deficiencies of traditional installation or authentication techniques or systems that the claimed subject matter eliminates.

In fact, Bartek, *et al*. teaches against *a physical interface component that physically couples at least two devices to establish a non-physical connection between the at least two devices*. Specifically, Bartek, *et al*. describes inherent weaknesses of a "cable-based peripheral connection," including a lack of mobility and functionality. *See* [0004]. Therefore, Bartek, *et al*. clearly establishes the advantages of employing a wireless connection over a physical connection. However, although Bartek, *et al*. recognizes the benefits of a wireless connection (*e.g.*, aesthetics and mobility), such wireless connections still suffer from the aforementioned installation or authentication problems that the claimed subject matter mitigates.

Additionally, Bartek, *et al*. fails to teach or suggest *a token key that physically connects the at least two devices simultaneously, stores at least one of an installation protocol or an authentication protocol for later use and establishes the non-physical connection*. Instead, Bartek, *et al*. simply describes wireless communication between a peripheral and a computer,

wherein the wireless communication transmits registration information about the peripheral. *See* [0029]. However, unlike the protocols recited in independent claim 1, this registration information is not stored for later use; instead, the registration information is immediately sent to the personal computer. Therefore, Bartek, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest a token key as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons as stated above, Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.*, and Bartek, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element as recited in independent claim 1. Furthermore, at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1, Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.*, and Bartek, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element as recited in claims 2-4, 8 and 10. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn and the subject claims allowed.

Similarly, independent claim 12 recites in part, "*a physical interface component that provides a physical connection between at least a device and a network entity* such that the device and the network entity are communicatively coupled upon removal of the physical interface component, wherein the physical interface component comprises *a token key that: physically connects at least the device and the network entity simultaneously, reserves at least one of an installation protocol or an authentication protocol for later use and establishes the non-physical connection.*" For at least the reasons as stated above with respect to independent claim 1, Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.*, and Bartek, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element as recited in independent claim 12 (and associated dependent claim 14). Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn and the subject claims allowed.

Likewise, independent claim 20 recites in part, "*a universal serial bus cable that connects at least one wireless device and at least one network entity* to invoke at least one of an installation protocol or an authentication protocol for a wireless connection between the at least one wireless device and the at least one network entity so that the at least one wireless device and the at least one network entity communicate wirelessly upon disconnecting the cable, wherein the universal serial bus cable comprises *a token key that: is physically connected to a plurality of wireless devices, reserves the at least one of the installation protocols or the authentication protocols for later use and establishes non-physical connections between the plurality of wireless devices and the network entity.*" For at least the reasons as described above regarding

independent claims 1 and 12, Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.*, and Bartek, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 20. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn and independent claim 20 allowed.

Further, independent claim 25 recites in part, "***storing at least one of an installation protocol or an authentication protocol for later use on a token key*** within a physical interface component; ***physically connecting a plurality of wireless devices and at least one network entity*** to the physical interface component." For at least the reasons as described above with regard to independent claims 1, 12 and 20, Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.*, and Bartek, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 25 and associated dependent claim 26. Thus, this rejection should be withdrawn and claims 25 and 26 allowed.

Additionally, independent claim 32 recites in part, "***physically connecting a plurality of wireless devices to a physical interface component***, the physical interface component comprising a token key; ***storing at least one of an installation protocol or an authentication protocol for later use within the token key***." For at least the reasons as noted *supra* regarding claims 1, 12, 20 and 25, Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.*, and Bartek, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in independent claim 32. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn and independent claim 32 allowed.

Further, independent claim 35 recites in part, "***means for physically coupling at least two devices by establishing a physical connection between the at least two devices so that the at least two devices communicate wirelessly upon being physically decoupled***." For at least the reasons as noted *supra* regarding claims 1, 12, 20, 25 and 32, Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.*, and Bartek, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 35. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn and independent claim 35 allowed.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.*, and Bartek, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach, or suggest each and every element recited in the subject claims. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn and the subject claims allowed.

II.   Rejection of Claims 6, 9, 15-19, 21, 27 and 30 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 6 and 9, which depend from independent claim 1, claims 15-19, which depend from independent claim 12, and claim 21, which depends from independent claim 20, and claims 27 and 30, which depend from independent claim 25, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Phillips, *et al.*, in view of Hocker, *et al.* and in view of Bartek, *et al.*, and further in view of Plasson, *et al.* (U.S. 6,795,688). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.*, Bartek, *et al.*, and Plasson, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the subject claims.

As discussed *supra*, with respect to independent claims 1, 12, 20 and 25, Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.*, and Bartek, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature recited in the independent claims. For example, the cited art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest, "*a physical interface component that physically couples at least two devices to establish a non-physical connection between the at least two devices.*" Plasson, *et al.*, which relates to a method and system for configuring a personal area network based on the degree of mobility of the elements of the network, fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies.

Accordingly, Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.*, Bartek, *et al.* and Plasson, *et al.*, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1, 12, 20 and 25. At least by virtue of their dependency, Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.*, Bartek, *et al.* and Plasson, *et al.* taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 6, 9, 15-19, 21, 27 and 30. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn and the subject claims allowed.

III.   Rejection of Claims 13 and 28 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 13, which depends from independent claim 25, and claim 28, which depends from independent claim 25, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Phillips, *et al.*, in view of Hocker, *et al.* and in view of Bartek, *et al.*, and further in view of Chaskar, *et al.* (U.S. 2005/0066044). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.*, Bartek, *et al.*, and Chaskar, *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

As discussed *supra*, with respect to independent claims 12 and 25, Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.*, and Bartek, *et al.*, either alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in the independent claims. For example, the cited art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest, "*a physical interface component that physically couples at least two devices to establish a non-physical connection between the at least two devices*." Chaskar, *et al.*, which relates to an internet protocol based location determination session providing location service, fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies.

Accordingly, Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.*, Bartek, *et al.* and Chaskar, *et al.*, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 12 and 25. At least by virtue of their dependency, Phillips, *et al.*, Hocker, *et al.*, Bartek, *et al.* and Chaskar, *et al.* taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 13 and 28. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn and the subject claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

The subject application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP463US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

  /Laura Marie Ulatowski/
Laura Marie Ulatowski
Reg. No. 63,646

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
127 Public Square
57th Floor, Key Tower
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731